UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,455	06/14/2006	Sylvain Duvillard	FR030154	6873

65913 7590 05/23/2008

NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, HAI L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2816	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/23/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,455	DUVILLARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HAI L. NGUYEN	2816	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 June 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment received on 01/17/2008 has been reviewed and considered with the following results:

As to the objection to the drawings, Applicant's clarification has overcome the objection, as such; the objection has been withdrawn.

As to the objections to the specification, Applicant's new abstract is acceptable; as such; the objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

As to the prior art rejections to the claims, Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections by the previous office action, mailed on 10/19/2007, have been fully considered and found persuasive. Therefore, the prior art rejections have been withdrawn. However, a new action on the merits appears below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. (US 5,430,397; herein after Itoh) in view of Hiiragizawa (US 5,963,075).

With regard to claim 1, Itoh discloses in Figs. 1-4 a circuit comprising a plurality of interconnected logic blocks (2a – 2f); a main clock generator (5) for distributing a reference clock signal (14) to the logic blocks; at least one local clock generator (6a – 6f)

in each logic block for generating a respective synchronized local clock signal from the reference clock signal for further provision to respective elements (9a - 11) of the logic block. Itoh shows a circuit meeting all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except that Itoh does not discloses a set of local clock signals of a first block is phase shifted relative to a set of local clock signals of a second block. Hiiragizawa teaches in Figs. 5-9B a similar functional circuit having a local clock signal (111) of a first block (104) is phase shifted relative to a local clock signal (112) of a second block (105) in order to inhibit all clock signals conduct the setting operation at the same time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize that teaching of Hiiragizawa in the circuit of Itoh by having a set of local clock signals of a first block is phase shifted relative to a set of local clock signal of a second block for the advantage of being able to reduce the power consumption. Resultantly, the power consumption related to the setting operation can be minimized. Thus, claim 1 does not distinguish patentably over Itoh in view of Hiiragizawa.

With regard to claim 2, the first and second blocks communicate via a one-way data path (106 in Fig. 5 of Hiiragizawa).

With regard to claims 3 and 4, the first block comprises a first logic cell configured to write data onto the one-way data path on a rising edge of one of the local clock signals of the first block provided at an enable input of the first logic cell and the second block comprises a second logic cell configured to read the written data from the one-way data path on a rising edge of one of the local clock signals of the second block provided at an enable input of the second logic cell /or on a failing edge of the reference clock signal provided at an enable input of the second logic cell (as depicted in Figs. 7

and 8 of Hiiragizawa). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to read/or write data on either a rising/or falling edge of the clock signal in order to meet the specific condition of the particular application.

With regard to claim 5, the circuit further comprises at least two additional blocks (see Fig. 4 of Itoh) that communication via a two-way data bus (106 in Fig. 5 of Hiiragizawa) and wherein respective sets of local clock signals of the at least two additional logic blocks are synchronized with each other.

Conclusion

4. In view of the new grounds of rejection, this action is non-final.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai L. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1747 and Right Fax number is 571-273-1747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Richards can be reached on 571-272-1736. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. L. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2816
5/10/200

/N. Drew Richards/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2816